

REMARKS

This Reply and Amendment is intended to be completely responsive to this non-final Office Action. Claims 1-44 are pending in this Application. Claims 14-19 are currently withdrawn from consideration. Claims 22 and 23 have been allowed. Claim 43 is objected to. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 12, 21-22, 26-27, 29-30, 33, and 39 have been amended.

Allowed/Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 22-23

In Section 11 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner allowed Claims 22 and 23. The Applicants thank the Examiner for allowance of Claims 22 and 23.

Claims 24-25 and 33-38

In Section 12 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 24-25 and 33-38 would be allowable is rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

The Applicants have amended independent Claim 22 to address the rejections of Claims 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 24-25.

The Applicants have amended independent Claim 33 to address the rejections of Claim 33-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 33-38.

Claims 12 and 27

In Section 13 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 12 and 27 would be allowable is rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants have amended dependent Claims 12 and 27 and independent Claims 1 and 26 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2, and to recite a combination of subject matter that the Applicants believe is patentable in view of the cited references.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 12 and 27.

Claim 43

In Section 14 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner indicated that Claim 43 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants have amended independent Claim 39 to include the limitations of dependent Claim 43. Dependent Claims 40-42 and 44 depend from independent Claim 39 (as amended). The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 39-42 and 44.

Objections to the Specification

In Section 2 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract because it is not in the form of one paragraph.

The Applicants have provided a replacement Abstract in the form of a single paragraph. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract..

In Section 3 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because of several informalities.

The Applicants have amended paragraph 0029 to recite an “article interface portion 60” for consistency, and have added “the” before “article” for greater clarity. The Applicants have amended paragraph 0034 for improved clarity. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the Specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2

In Section 5 of the detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-13, 20-21 and 24-38 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

The Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 22, 26 and 33 for clarity and to address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2, and have amended certain corresponding dependent claims for conformance.

The Applicants believe that the rejection of Claims 1-13, 20-21 and 24-38 has been overcome and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Canni et al.

In Section 7 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 21 and 26 as being anticipated by Canni et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 1 (as amended) is in independent form and dependent Claims 2-4 and 21 depend from independent Claim 1. Claim 1 (as amended) now recites a “system for attaching articles in a vehicle” comprising, in combination with other limitations, a “base comprising a cavity” and a “retention device cooperating with the cavity.” A “system for attaching articles in a vehicle” as recited in independent Claim 1 (as amended) is not identically disclosed by Canni et al. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of independent Claim 1 (as amended) and dependent Claims 2-4 and 21.

Claim 26 (as amended) is in independent form. Independent Claim 26 (as amended) now recites a “kit for attaching articles” comprising, in combination with other limitations, a “passage within the base portion configured to receive at least a portion of an article” and a “retention device adapted to couple the article to the passage.” A “kit for attaching articles” as recited in Claim 26 (as amended) is not identically disclosed by Canni et al. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of independent Claim 26 (as amended).

Suman et al.

In Section 8 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 13, 20-21, 26 and 28 as being anticipated by Suman et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 1 (as amended) is in independent form and dependent Claims 2-5, 13 and 20-21 depend from independent Claim 1. Claim 1 (as amended) now recites a “system for attaching articles in a vehicle” comprising, in combination with other limitations, a “base comprising a cavity” and a “retention device cooperating with the cavity.” A “system for attaching articles in a vehicle” as recited in independent Claim 1 (as amended) is not identically disclosed by Suman et al. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 1 (as amended) and dependent Claims 2-5, 13 and 20-21.

Claim 26 (as amended) is in independent form and dependent Claim 28 depends from independent Claim 26 (as amended). Claim 26 (as amended) now recites a “kit for attaching articles” comprising, in combination with other limitations, a “passage within the base portion configured to receive at least a portion of an article” and a “retention device adapted to couple the article to the passage.” A “kit for attaching articles” as recited in independent Claim 26 (as amended) is not identically disclosed by Suman et al. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 26 (as amended) and dependent Claim 28.

De Angelis et al.

In Section 9 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 21, 26 and 30 as being anticipated by De Angelis et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 1 (as amended) is in independent form and dependent Claims 2-4, 6 and 21 depend from independent Claim 1. Claim 1 (as amended) now recites a “system for attaching articles in a vehicle” comprising, in combination with other limitations, a “base comprising a cavity” and a “retention device cooperating with the cavity.” A “system for attaching articles in a vehicle” as recited in independent Claim 1 (as amended) is not identically disclosed by

De Angelis et al. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 1 (as amended) and dependent Claims 2-4, 6 and 21.

Claim 26 (as amended) is in independent form and dependent Claim 30 depends from independent Claim 26 (as amended). Independent Claim 26 (as amended) now recites a “kit for attaching articles” comprising, in combination with other limitations, a “passage within the base portion configured to receive at least a portion of an article” and a “retention device adapted to couple the article to the passage.” A “kit for attaching articles” as recited in independent Claim 26 (as amended) is not identically disclosed by De Angelis et al. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent Claim 26 (as amended) and dependent Claim 30.

Japanese Reference 2001055091

In Section 10 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-11, 21, 26, 29-32, 39-42 and 44 as being anticipated by Japanese reference 2001055091 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 1 (as amended) is in independent form and dependent Claims 2-11 and 21 depend from independent Claim 1. Claim 1 (as amended) now recites a “system for attaching articles in a vehicle” comprising, in combination with other limitations, a “base comprising a cavity” and a “retention device cooperating with the cavity.” A “system for attaching articles in a vehicle” as recited in independent Claim 1 (as amended) is not identically disclosed by Japanese reference 2001055091. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of independent Claim 1 (as amended) and dependent Claims 2-11 and 21.

Claim 26 (as amended) is in independent form and dependent Claims 29-32 depend from independent Claim 26 (as amended). Independent Claim 26 (as amended) now recites a “kit for attaching articles” comprising, in combination with other limitations, a “passage within the base portion configured to receive at least a portion of an article” and a “retention device adapted to couple the article to the passage.” A “kit for attaching articles” as recited in

independent Claim 26 (as amended) is not identically disclosed by Japanese Reference 2001055091. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of independent Claim 26 (as amended) and dependent Claims 29-32.

Claim 39 (as amended) is in independent form and dependent Claims 40-42 and 44 depend from independent Claim 39 (as amended). Independent Claim 39 now recites a “universal mounting adapter” comprising, in combination with other limitations, an “interlock device adapted to maintain the base in a coupled relationship with the receiving member.” A “universal mounting adapter” as recited in independent Claim 39 (as amended) is not identically disclosed in Japanese reference 2001055091. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of independent Claim 39 (as amended) and dependent Claims 40-42 and 44.

* * *

The Applicants respectfully submit that each and every outstanding objection and rejection to the pending claims has been overcome, and the Application is in condition for allowance. Claims 22 and 23 have previously been allowed. Claim 43 has been cancelled without prejudice to further prosecution on the merits. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 12, 21-22, 26-27, 29-30, 33, and 39 have been amended. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-13, 20-21, 24-42 and 44.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 8, 2004

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5591
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

By 
John M. Lazarus
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 48,367